App. F. IX-4

1925.

File No. 322-25

Previous References
104-21-
739-18-1-41
148-19-1-5
572-20 1 6 & 7

Serial Nos. 4-6,8-

Later References
334-27-1-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 7

Part B for July 1927

SUBJECT

Seringapatam Peshkar's Case

G.O. No. 91-2 dated 15-7-27

To the Dy. Comr
" Commr

Govt approve of the views of the Deputy Commissioner.

1039

REPLY

(To be written on this margin.)

MUZRAI
8 JUN 192

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL

8/5249

NOTE

Dated....Mysore., 26th June ....192 6.

No. M-58

Subject.- Seringaptam Peshkar's case

17

I do not know if the final report on this matter has been received from the Muzrai Commissioner. If not please send a reminder.

Revenue Secretary
with compliments.

26/6/26

18

Please attend very early

26626

29/6

AV 29/6

D1529 2 r/

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No 322-25 of 192

Serial No

(XX)

In reference to the second paragraph of the above, ~~the~~ Hindi reference is solicited from the Notes of the late First Member of Council page 1 paragraphs 6-9 and the Office note para 3 of page 2 supra. The pershkari papers were under work in the Mng Com'r Office at the time of inspection of the Members and have not been received through the Mng Com'r yet in this Office.

Draft letter to the Mng: Com'r is submitted for approval and orders.

D/ 6.7.25

Refce.- Paras 17 & 18 above.

The draft D.O. remains to be m.c., for the report of action taken in the matter, may kindly be shown to me.

D/7

Shown
issue
GS
7726

D/7

4 From, The Mng Com'r
Letter no. C. 1429 D/ 15.9
Reports Encl 4

P. M. D

Serial No

of the action taken by the Dy. Com.r regarding Peshkar Narasimhiah of Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Seringapatam.

24 The Dy. Com.r has degraded the Peshkar, and has given him a ministerial appointment on Rs 30/ in the Dist.t office, in addition to the departmental punishment of Suspension for the period of absence subsequent to the leave on average salary till the date of joining duty in the Mysore Dist.t Office.

5 From, Peshkar Narasimhiah.

Petition 13.9.26

praying representations in the matter.

The Dy. Com.r's letter and the Ven. records connected with the case, have not been received. A Off. calling for the records is submtd. for approval.

21.9.1926

Reg.r:- Manik's minute. (Para 17 above)

P.V.D is for perusal.

The M.C. approves of the action taken by the D.C.

For orders. If necessary, with the D.C's letter, the records may be called for

381

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No 372 of 1925

Serial No

His Peshkar (K P).

a draft ~~calling~~ is put up for orders.

22/9

(M Rev. Secy)

2nd Reference is invited to the members minute, Para 17 above, the final report of the me regarding the Peshkar has been received. (PWD) Perhaps it is not necessary for Govt to call for the records. on the appeal of the Peshkar.

23.9.26.

2nd member)

23/9

2. We cannot take any action on the representation directly submitted by this official to Govt. The M.C.'s letter does not give sufficient information for understanding the action taken in this case by the subordinate M.C. Reference is made to misappropriation and also necessary to know of the nature quality of it and if so why this person is retained here in service. The records may be called for.

27/9

2:1 May the draft already put up calling for the records in the case, issue? The draft may be approved for issue

draft cas 27.9.26

29/9

(Rev. Secy)

29/9

Approved

29/9

OFFICE OF THE SECOND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL. SEP 1926 No 2288

FINANCIAL SECRETARY 1 OCT. 1926 No.

Note— Contn. Sheet

5 10

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 322 of 1925.

Serial No.	
6.	To, The Inuzzai Comr. No. 642 dy 5.10.26. Calls for a copy of The Dy. Comr's. letter refd. to in Sl. 5, with The entire records.
8.	From, The Inuzzai Comr. Letter no. C. 1429 dy 20.10.26 Submits The Dy. Comr's. memo (without date) together with The records received therewith.
A	To The Mysore Dy Comr's. Report received with The M.C's letter under advertence goes fully into The facts of The case. The Dy Comr Visited The Spot, and on an examination of The parties concerned and after meeting The Dharmadarsi on 20-7-1926 and going through The proceedings which they placed before him, has submitted his report for orders of Govt. The several allegations against The Peshkar are noted in pages 4 and 5 of The said memo and all These are dealt with by The Dy. Comr. In his concluding para (vide page 14 of The memo) The D.C. says That There are clear cases of misappropriation

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-20
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 322 of 192

Serial No.

for which Peshkar Vrua saidhiali is responsible in respect of the purchase of Javali for Sri Gangadhareswara Swamy temple and the balance or scale pan for Sri Rangnatha Swamy temple if all other items are ignored / and that the Peshkar with some others is responsible for the loss of the temple rice. Re these items, the following information gathered from a study of the records is submitted-

A. (i) Javali of Sri Gangadhareswara Swamy temple relating to the year 1920:—

This matter is dealt with in para 3 on page 9 of the D.C's report. It is said that a sum of Rs 45-2-7 was sanctioned for special purchase of Panchay to the deity during the year 1920, and the D.C. thinks that the Peshkar drew this amount. In this connection the Peshkar's explanation dt. 6/10/24 (vide para 2 on page 3) is solicited. He explains that

B separately (in File no. VI).

as There was a lot of 2 ½ gg.
gg. & 2 ½ ele- in the temple, and
as it was very necessary to have
cloth for Kotarotsava, he utilized
the amount for purchasing
2 pieces (thans) of White Jagannath
cloth and 1 piece (than) of Alwan
that these articles were pro-
duced before the Dharmedar
and the Taluk Amildar who
after seeing these articles
passed the accounts for the
month and payment was
accordingly made, and that
these articles were being
used for the purpose till
1924; and no fresh purchase
These articles was made
during the years 1921 to 24 (1924.
He says that it does not find
a place in the Stock Register
of the temple. as it is no
Jamali purchased for the mosque
but ref. is made to it in
Parpatyegar's change register
of 1920 ele. With a view to
ascertain the truth of this
statement, it is desirable
to look into Roz(Jamdi) and

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2j

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 322 of 1925

Serial No.

Khurd for Oct, Nov and Dec 1920, and also the Temple Pan-ba Thegar's charge Register for that year, and a Dft. calling for them to Submit.

2536(2) Purchase of a Scale pan for Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple:—

39 In page 16 of his Report, the D.C. says that the Peshkar appropriated a sum of Rs 7-11-7 from Nuisance for the purchase of a balance but no balance was purchased, and the amount has been misappropriated.

This matter is Refd. to in the records forming File no. VII. From Stanik Tirumalicugar's Statement dt 15. 12. 1925, it is seen that in the temple budget for March 25 (when he was Jirti Sumes) a sum of Rs 4 and odd was provided for the purchase of a scale pan, that he (received the amount, and) gave a Voucher for it to the Peshkar, that the Peshkar told him that he had purchased lamps

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 322 of 1925

Serial No

That the amount was accordingly paid to [illegible] Co [illegible] do [illegible] of S. Patam who had supplied lamps, and a Vouchree given by the Shop-keeper for the amount paid to him, is with him (Torimalaiyar).

D

(1) In his Kyphiyat dt 15.12.25, Sepoy Putta who was then on aq. in Salem for a year, says that the Peshkar did not give him new lamps, but that some 8 months ago, 4 lamps and 1 wall-lamp was given to him, and that besides these, nothing was given to him since. According to Putta's Kyphiyat if lamps were supplied some 8 months prior to 15-12-1925. The date of his deposition, it may be in about April 1925, while the amount was provided in the temple Budget for March 1925. From the Statutes Statement, it is clear that the amounts seems to have been received by him, under a Vo

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 322 of 1925

Serial No.

for the purchase of bangles given by the Shop-keeper is with him. The written explan of the Peshkar in the matter is not on the file and it is not quite clear how the D.C. thinks that the Peshkar misappropriated this sum.

(3) misappropriation of temple rice during the period rice was stocked in the temple.

This matter is dealt with in para no. 4 on page 12 of the D.C's Report. It is mentioned that out of 698 bags of rice of 75 seers each issued from Ananda Rice mill, Ganjam from Jany. 1921 to March 1925, a shortage of 1260 seers was noticed — the D.C reports that though the Peshkar complained to the Taluk about the inconveniences in the said mill where rice was supplied out of the temple paddy stored there, the Amildar did not take prompt action in the matter nor take stocks of temple rice and check accounts in detail. The D.C. thinks that the Peshkar misappropriated a portion of the rice

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 372 of 1925

Serial No.

with the mill under Taluk orders without Peshkar's intervention. The latter has produced the original letter written directly to the mill authorities by G. B. Rajiengar on 22/4/1922 and the reply of the mill authorities thereon. Both Rajiengar have been ~~ordered not to~~ examined in my office ~~after Patten~~. The Peshkar has complained to the Taluk about the irregularities on the part of the mill authorities viz. supply of inferior quality of rice, not milling temple paddy in the presence of temple servants and other irregularities. There was shortage in the quantity of the rice supplied to the temple, but the Taluk authorities did not take any action in the matter and the correspondence is said to be missing. (Register extracts received from the Taluk are flagged). It is said that out of 698 bags of rice of 75 seers each supplied from Janv. 1921 to March 1925, a shortage of 1260 seers was found

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 322 of 1925

Serial No.

which works out to about 2½ seers per palla. The Peshkar explains that the shortage is due not only to difference in measuring sticks, but also to the fact that the milled rice is hot (2805 Coll), and measures more, and as it cools after it is taken out of the mill, shortage is observed, and has produced written opinions of some mill-owners and rice shop-keepers (41) to my force, all of which support the above statement. He further states that the Stock Register of temple rice was checked by the Divisional on 19.7.1922. With a view to know how the temple rice was being accounted for etc. a Petn. calling for the original Stock Register, is put up for Appl. It is significant that the D.C. has ordered that the said 2 Rajiengars should not be allowed to continue in their appointments as Serinagapatam (vide last sentence in the D.C's report)

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 322 of 1925

Serial No.

45 Broken Rice (Cog & Dec).

It is said that 1074 seers of broken rice were issued from Ananda Rice mill to the temple for 4 years from 1921 to 1925 or some 22 seers per month or about ¾ seer of Cog & Dec per day. The Peshkar explains that as per manual, this was given away for Rangoli and the quantity spent does not appear to be excessive in view of the fact that there is no separate Rangoli fund for the same.

The D.O. says that during his personal enquiry at S. Pattam, the temple Dharmakartas placed their Rep. of the 20th Jan. 1926 before him. A copy of the Rep. has not been received, and it seems necessary to call for it with a view to know the opinion of the Dharmakartas on the several allegations against the Peshkar. A Ltr calling for it is submitted for appl. or orders.

9-11-1926

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

579 15 20

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

and Revenue
oretariat

Mer File No. 322 of 1925-26

Serial No.	
	47 The Registers rcpd from the Dept-letter W/o the Mag Conr as well as the Proc: of Dharmadarsis rcpd by the Dy Conr may be returned to persnl. Dept letter W/o the Mer. Conr may be appd. BG 10/11/26 47/Issue MD 18/11
9.	To, mer Conr= No 8968 dt 16.11.26 Calls for certain documents connected with the case.
10.	From, the Mag. Conr. Letter no C.383 dt 29-1-1927. Submits the records called for in Sl. 9 with the exception of the Khand for 1920, and Parpatyegar's charge register for 1920 relating to Sri Gangadharaswara Swamy temple. 47 The under mentioned documents were called for :— (1) Roz Khand for Oct., Nov. and Dec. 1920 refd. to in the concluding part of para 3 of the Office note - This document was produced before the Dy. Conr during the inspection of S. Patam temple on 25-7-1926, but it is now found

Sec'y 5/12

qeq q. The D.C's report dtd (R) & also dtd.

DTL—Contn. Sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2J

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 322 of 1925-6

Serial No.

The disappearance is explained away that it must be with Peshkar Narasimhiah. Narasimhiah was divested of the charge of Parpathegar's duties of Sri Gangadhareswara Swamy temple on 25-9-1924, and was relieved of the office of Peshkar on 25-11-1925, and the Roz Khard which was seen by the Dy. Comr subsequently on 25-7-1926, cannot be with the Peshkar.

(1) This is the document in which the daily transactions are recorded.

50 (ii) Parpathegar's charge register for 1920:-

These registers (ಕೆ ೨೯೦ ಇಂ ೮೬) 5 in number were locked in 25 Book No. 5 has been initialled by the D.C. under date 10-12-1925. Among the articles newly supplied for 1920 on 2-4-1920, mention of Alwan (ಕೆ೦ಕ್ಷ. ಕ್ಷ ೪ ಡಿ, ಕ್ಷ ೨೫ ಇ, ಕೆ೦೭ ೭ಕ್ಷ, ಇ೦೧ ೮೬) is made.

(2)

79 R/

51 (iii) Stock Registers of temple vice:-

2 Registers have been received

This registers was checked by the Taluk Amildar on 19-7-1922

29 Q/ (25)

A perusal of these Registers will also show that there is no Register

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26

Serial No.

Column for broken rice (90 2 dec 5) and The Amildar who inspected these registers does not appear to have issued any special instructions to open a separate Column for it.

(4) (IV) The Proceedings of the Dharmadarsis of the 20th July 1926 produced during the Dy Cmrs inspection of the institution (Vide page 6 of the Dy. Cmrs report).

24 A (5) The Dy Cmr reports that he met the Dharmadarsis on 20th July 1926 and heard them in detail and also went through the proceedings which they placed before him. With a View to know the views of the Dharmadarsis on the several charges levelled against the Peshkar, a copy of the proceedings was called for. The D.C. has sent 3 registers containing the resolutions Resolution of the meetings of Dharmadarsis and the last entry therein relates to 22-11-1925 that made in

P1 There is nothing to show whether as reported by the Dy Cmr the temple Dharmadarsis drew up proceedings of their meeting [illegible] Dy Cmr [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

1046 18 23

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 322 of 192[illegible] 6

Serial No.

H1

54 In G.O no 2208-10/mis 1418-19 dt 21-12-1920, d Narasimhachi was appointed as Peshkar of Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Srirangapatam.

55 Submitted for orders

BD 9/2/27

56 The disappearance of Regr files & papers mentioned by the DC & Head officers is highly suspicious, and there does not seem to be much in the statement that Narasimhaiya has made away with them, as he was placed under suspension thereby access to the temple records, as shown above. The Peshkar may perhaps be heard in person.

BD 14/2/27

PTO

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 322 of 1925.

Serial No.

57 This file relates to the enquiry into the conduct of Narasimhaiya, peshkar of the Sri Ranganatha Swami temple, Seringapatam. The Muzrai Commissioner has forwarded a memorandum prepared by the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore, embodying the results of the enquiry he conducted. In view of the serious nature of the irregularities for which the Deputy Commissioner considered the Peshkar responsible he has taken him to his office as Deputy Clerk in the Muzrai Department. While the enquiry went on, the man was ~~previously~~ on privilege leave for four months, on furlough on full average salary for two months and under suspension for about 3½ months.

58 There is a very large number of petitions against the peshkar in the file and the complaint are many and various. They range from the statements that the peshkar had reduced the temple into a play house by getting flowerpots for being placed near the utsava Image and he treated the temple servants with indign to the grave charge that the peshkar was regularly misappropriating the javali [illegible] of the Sri Gangadhareswara and Kasi Visves temples, that he was fabricating accounts

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 327 of 192 5

Serial No.

3,Y,X,

using moneys for himself. Vinay petitions states that he had the support of Mr. B. Narasinga Rao in the place and was doing much evil under that gentleman's shelter. Several petitions from the temple servants state that the peshkar was mulcting them of the perquisites such as temple rice, fruit and cocoanut; that he levied three pies of kanike from all who came to the temple and told the devotees that it was unnecessary for them to give any dakshine for mangalarathi or theertha and thus came in the way of temple servants getting some small cash; that when they were carrying their share of rice home, he would have it taken out by way of search and check. That he refused leave to temple servants, that he was misusing the jewellery of the temple and taking commission on purchases, that the peshkar changed the hours of worship just as he liked to the inconvenience of the devotees visiting the temple, that under his management temple servants took the food meant for visitors from outside are other complaints in other petitions.

59 The complaints may be summarised under the following heads:-

1. He reappropriated money from sanctioned

NOTE—Contn. sheet

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 322 of 1925.

Serial No.

heads for other purposes.

2. He made purchases himself instead of through the contractor.

3. By these means he created opportunities for appropriating some of the money for himself

4. He took commission on purchases made for the temple.

5. He has misappropriated rice supplied to the temple.

6. He compelled devotees to give kanike a misappropriated Kanike collections

7. He reduced the perquisites o temple servants.

8. He treated temple servants with harshness.

6. The Sub Division Officer's report and the Deputy Commissioner's report go fully into the charges made in the petitions. The first thing that strikes a person reading the petitions is that they mostly come from a few discontented persons who have some specific grudge against the peshkar. People write petitions against a man only when they have some reason to complain but the petitioners in this case are a specific few and they are mostly temple servants either past or present. The Deputy Commissioner takes note of this aspect of the case but says

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 2293—GPB—10,000—4-5-27

Serial No.

that unless the accomplices fall out, there is no chance of dishonest transactions coming to light. The fact however remains that the main charges against the peshkar came from men who were temple servants once and who have been removed from that service.

61 With regard to the various allegations the records show that the peshkar could not have been very straightforward and honest. In the things which it is clear he did, apart from those of which we may only suspect him, he however only continued a system that had been in force before him. In the matter of reappropriating money in the sanctioned scale from one head to another (what in the records is called "babhorale") for example it would seem to have been a matter of routine to readjust the sanctioned amount for various purposes so as to meet the day's needs. The peshkar generally brought such readjustment to the notice of the Dharmadarsies and they generally approved. Sometimes he might not have taken sanction. But in a large institution like the Seringapatam temple, getting sanction to every item of such deviation readjustment, once deviation is permitted, would be almost impossible. ~~It is stated that under cover of this procedure,~~

W1

The S.D.O in his order of 27 5 1923 (Y) appears to have admitted the necessity for Babhorale' 'Babhorale' has to be avoided as a rule - The Amildar says that there is no time to obtain sanction. There is withdrawal & abstraction and expenditure cannot be made before the order of sanction is obtained in time, and if not the ordinary Babhorale application

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

as in any special case The Dharmadarsies opinion also may be obtained

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 322 of 1925

Serial No.

~~money was misappropriated~~. It would hardly be fair to make him responsible for error in procedure but the suspicion remains that some cases of reappropriation may have been intended to facilitate misappropriation.

The peshkar seems to have made purchases himself instead of through the contractor in many cases. This was wrong and as stated by the Deputy Commissioner, gives rise to the suspicion that there was a design for misappropriation in this. It is stated that the peshkar claimed to have spent some money in getting some white washing done but that no white washing was done really. The Deputy Commissioner observes that the peshkar should have got the work done through a contractor after getting the estimate sanctioned. Why this omission was not noticed at the time the amount was claimed is not clear. The peshkar is not the final authority on temple expenditure. He submitted accounts from time to time and the higher offices should have checked the accounts. Enquiry as to why work was done without sanction to an estimate should have been set on foot long ago and the fact of a false claim having been made for work not done brought home to the peshkar.

yes, only a suspicion! The S.D.O. who held a detailed enquiry observes (o) I do not mean to imply that all the sums received Varasimhappa were appropriated to his own benefit. A fairly substantial portion of them must necessarily have been incurred in making either purchases or payments to parties..... for services rendered."

(Page 11) A

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

Just now, it is merely a case of surmise and suspicion that the peshkar got the work done himself in order to misappropriate the amount of the bill.

63 That Narasimhaiya might have (misappropriated or not properly accounted) part of the money which passed through his hands and took commission occasionally from persons having dealings with the temple is possible but this is no more than might be said against almost any other person in a similar position whose daily work places him in situations giving room for suspicion.

64 The case of misappropriation of rice supplied to the temple is peculiar. The arrangement in force seems to have been to leave the temple paddy in the rice mill and for the mill people to send word to the peshkar when the paddy would be hulled so that he could send some one to see the hulling and get whatever rice was due from the mill. The mill people seem not to have always sent word in time but simply given quantities of rice when the temple servant came. (How not sending word in time affected quantity of supply is not clear .) The peshkar would appear to have received the rice at the quantity stated in the mill invoice without always

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 2293—GPB—10,000—4-5-27

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 322 of 192 5

Serial No.

measuring it. This was foolish. But there is some responsibility on others also in this connection. The peshkar complained to the amildar about the irregular procedure of the mill people. The amildar however does not seem to have taken any steps on the peshkar's report. The records are not now forthcoming but the extracts from taluk registers show clearly that the peshkar complained to the Amildar a number of times. The quantity of deficiency for which it is proposed to make the peshkar responsible is rather large; i.e., nearly 1,900 seers. But this was spread over a number of years and works out to about 4 seers per bag of supply. The peshkar explains the difference as due to the rice warm from the mill measuring more than the rice cooled in the stores and has produced the opinions of several rice merchants to show that there is a reduction of 2½ or 3 seers for every bag of rice due to this cooling and measurement. In fairness to the peshkar this fact must be admitted. As he says, differences were noticed in the course of the food control operations in measurement from place to place. All the quantities received were not always measured and when measured, what was taken as

(Page 13 of the D C's memo) A

To the D.C. observe Is it also reported that the amildar is not taking stock of the articles and other accounts in detail? How can the misappropriation of a person of the stock & cash be brought home to the peshkar? H

H1

I1

(Peshkar's explⁿ)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

a hundred seers in one place did not measure as a hundred seers in another. It is again quite possible that the peshkar did use some of the rice for himself, but this can hardly be said to be proved. The Deputy Commissioner states that in making his reports to the Amildar against the mill people the peshkar was creating evidence of supposed care while actually misappropriating rice. This view seems hard on the Peshkar. The peshkar received also about 1,000 seers of broken rice which he says he issued for "rangavalli". This rice is not shown in the accounts. It is quite conceivable that some of the broken rice was misused but without doubt some of it should have been used for rangavalli. 1,000 seers were used for a period of about 4 years i.e,, about two-thirds of a seer of broken rice per day. Unless other material were used for rangavalli -- and it does not appear this was the case -- this quantity is not too much for a big temple like the Seringapatam temple and the quantity misappropriated at any particular time could not have been very much.

65 There is nothing in the record to show that the peshkar compelled devotees to pay kanike; and the complaint that he misappropriated

1 Page 13 g.b d's report)

any kanike, the Deputy Commissioner considers as not substantiated.

(b) Then as regards the complaint that he reduced the perquisites of the temple servants and that he refused them leave and otherwise treated them harshly. The Deputy Commissioner considers that the peshkar must have reduced the perquisites in the shape of daily rice and other articles available for distribution to the temple servants. This was possible mainly because of reappropriation of provision from one head to another. If the rice used for nivedanam is reduced in order to find money for some other expenditure, the quantity of rice that each temple servant would get is automatically reduced. The other item for which money was spent might be flowers or scents which the temple servant would either not get or, if he got, could not use. As regards the peshkar's harsh treatment of subordinates, the Deputy Commissioner states that it is a matter of opinion but considers it likely that the peshkar was irritating in his treatment of the subordinates, not distinguishing sufficiently between regular servants and the more or less honorary officers. The Deputy Commissioner also states that the

WD 2293—GPB—10,000—4-5-27

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 322 of 1925.

Serial No.

complaint of non payment of miras and the reduction of emoluments to the temple servants is not unfounded. The peshkar admitted delay in two cases and gave certain explanations which were not satisfactory.

67 The Deputy Commissioner concludes that there are two clear cases of misappropriation for which the peshkar is responsible, even ignoring everything else and adding that everything else cannot be ignored. The two cases are that of the purchase of cloth for the Gangadhareswara Swami temple and of a balance for the Sri Ranganatha Swami temple. A sum of Rs 45 was taken for special purchase of panche in 1920 and every year there is an expenditure of Rs 25/- for javali for the temple. These purchases are not borne out by entries in the javali registers nor in the "Rose Khardu" to which the peshkar referred the Deputy Commissioner. As regards 1920, the peshkar explains that javali was not purchased but some other cloth for Kothar Uthsava. This is however stated not to be borne out by the records. Similarly about the purchase of a balance for the Sri Ranganatha Swami temple, there is reason to think that the peshkar misused the money.

The peshkar's explanation is not forthcoming in the papers in Mysore.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 2293—GPB—10,000—4-5-27

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 372 of 192 5

Serial No.

68 It is clear that the pesnkar was not very honest and straightforward but he succeeded to a vicious system in which much money passed through his hands without sufficient check from any higher authority. If one may judge from the tone of the petitions and of the Amildar in the reports, it would look as if he has come to grief in a trial of strength between Mr. Narasinga Rao and the Amildar. The peshkar was apparently identified as belonging to Mr. B. Narasinga Rao. He does not seem to have tried to satisfy the Amildar as to his good faith, but disobeyed instructions, reappropriated money for expenses differing from the sanctioned scale and forestalled objection by getting the approval of the Dharmadarsis among whom was Mr. B. Narasinga Rao. This is partly surmise. This is however fact that he was not checked in his doings early nor action taken on matters which he reported. While it would appear that the peshkar did not behave properly to the Amildar, often acted contrary to his instructions, possibly in some cases misused money which passed through his hands, it is stated that while he was peshkar, the affairs of the temple were managed better than ever. He however made a number of enemies

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 2293—GPB—10.000—4 5-27

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 327 of 192 5

Serial No.

possibly in remedying mismanagement of the sort that there always is in a temple. Not being over-honest himself he puts it in their power to impose on him.

The Deputy Commissioner gives full credit to the peshkar for his efficient management of the temple, yet proposes punishment which considering what is proved against the peshkar and in view of the other special circumstances of the case seems to be rather severe. He has been reduced from Rs 45 to Rs 30 after having suffered suspension for about 3½ months. The peshkar is prone to mis-employ money passing through his hands and should not be placed in independent charge of a temple or similar institution. The transfer to an office seems therefore quite proper as there is reason to suspect misappropriation of money in a few cases. A reduction for some definite period to a lower grade seems also necessary. Whether the punishment ordered by the Deputy Commissioner may however be somewhat reduced is for consideration..

69 The peshkar has given a representation addressed to the Chief Secretary requesting that he may be allowed to explain matters in person and through an advocate and stating that he has not been given a copy of the charges framed against him, nor heard in his defence. It is

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 2293—GPB—10,000—4-5-27

36

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 327 of 1925

Serial No.

not likely that he can say anything more in his own favour than has been already stated—that he has always worked with zeal and taken the approval of Dharmadarsis to his actions and that the smaller servants of the temple petitioned against him out of spite and that he kept the Amildar in touch with temple affairs and that the officer did not take action. The Deputy Commissioner gives full credit to the peshkar for his efficiency in the discharge of his duties and the other considerations cannot much affect the conclusions as to the peshkar's responsibility for the two or three cases of suspected misappropriation. There seems to be, therefore, no need to hear him or to advocate on his behalf.

7b) For perusal and orders.

2213
14.8.27

Where are the first 16 pages of the Note sheet?

May be submitted to the member separately - I do not wish to detain the file for this. Note—Contn. sheet has been cancelled as delay already - h

WD 2293—GPB—10,000—4 5-27

Serial No.

The office note from para 36 and the Under Secretary's note against which I have made some marginal remarks are fairly exhaustive and I do not wish to cover the same ground. The main contentions of the Peshkar are that he is not made aware of all the charges against him and that he has not been given an opportunity to cross examine the witnesses who deposed against him. He requests that he may be heard in person or by Counsel. His explanation as regards the several allegations made against him is reported to have been obtained and all the records necessary for the disposal of the case are before Government. I agree with the Under Secretary that there is no necessity for hearing the party in person or by Counsel.

The case of the Peshkar Narasimhia has been before Government more than once. He was absolved in 1922 of charges of mis-appropriation preferred against him and his case has since attracted some special attention in view of certain interpellatio in the Legislative Council in the February and June sessions of 1926 to elicit information regarding the conduct of the Amildar, Mr.T.Krishna Rao in relieving the Peshkar of the charge of some institutions at Seringapatam.

The conclusions of the Deputy Commissioner about the allegations against the Peshkar are contained in the first para on page 17 of his memorandum. They are:(1) The conduct of Peshkar Narasimhia since his appointment as Peshkar

Flag A

Note–Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

has been anything but satisfactory so far as accounting for moneys and his behaviour towards his official superiors are concerned.

(2) There are clear cases of misappropriation (a) in respect of the purchase of panche or in its stead alwan to Sri Gangadhareswara Swami Temple for Rs 45-2-7 and (b) of the balance (scales) for Sri Ranganatha Swami Temple (Rs 7-11-7).

(3) The Peshkar was responsible for the loss of an appreciable quantity of rice belonging to the temple.

75 As observed by the Deputy Commissioner the reappropriation (Babhorle) of items of expenditure and the utilisation of the Temple funds in anticipation of and without sanction of competent authority for purposes different from those prescribed in the authorised scale were mainly due to the support he got from the Dharmadarsis; and the local officers including the Sub Division Officer do not appear to have taken effective action to stop this irregularity in time.

Flag Y

76 Regarding the two specific cases of misappropriation above referred to the Deputy Commissioner recognises that they cannot successfully be prosecuted in a Criminal Court. The first item relates to an entry of Rs 45-2-7 for special purchase of panche in October 1920. This was during a period when Narasimhiah was not the Peshkar of the Sri Ranganatha Swami Temple but was Parpatyegar of the Sri Gangadhareswara Swami Temple.

Note–Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

No regular stock book appears to have been maintained and the articles purchased do not appear to have found an entry in the books. It is however difficult to disprove the statement made by the Peshkar that alwan was purchased in lieu of the panche for which the amount was charged in the accounts. In the absence of a regular audit of accounts it may be difficult to bring home the charge of misappropriation to the Peshkar.

(7) As regards the second item, the Deputy Commissioner's memorandum states that the Peshkar admits that the amount of Rs 7-11-7 provided for the purchase of a pair of scales was not utilised for the purpose intended but that was appropriated for meeting the cost of certain lamps previously purchased. This statement is supported by Sthanik Thirumula Iyengar which cannot, I think, be summarily rejected, though the procedure was irregular.

Flag C

(8) As regards the responsibility for the loss of an appreciable quantity of rice, the Peshkar has to share it with other temple servants and Taluk officials. As observed by the Deputy Commissioner it is regrettable that the Amildar did not take prompt action to have the stock examined in proper time and fix the responsibility on proper shoulders.

(9) The bulk of the petitions against the Peshkar is from the temple servants, whom he has evidently offended in more ways than one. There is one petition from an outsider which needs special mention. Mr.Gopalakrishna Iyengar, late Superintend-

Flag Z

Note—Contn. Sheet

ent

Serial No.

of the Secretariat, petitioned in March 1926 to the late First Member of Council that he gave a sum of Rs. 14 to the Peshkar about three years back for repairing the silver chamara of the Sri Ranganatha Swami temple but found that it had not been repaired. It is admitted that part of the amount given was used for purchasing chowri. The Deputy Commissioner makes a brief reference to this allegation by saying that the Peshkar has not satisfactorily explained the charge.

In view of the extenuating circumstances in this case as explained in detail in the Under Secretary's note, the smallness of the amounts not properly accounted for, the considerable lapse of time since the first item of misappropriation is said to have occured and the Peshkar's good record of work recognised by the successive Deputy Commissioners, it seems to me that the departmental punishment that has been meted out to him viz., reduction from Rs 45 to Rs 30 permanently is much too severe. He has not yet joined duty in the ministerial post as Deputy Muzrai clerk of the District Office. Sanction has been accorded by the Deputy Commissioner to the grant of his application for leave without allowances pending disposal of his representation to higher authorities. He has therefore sufficiently suffered pecuniarily. It is, however, out of question to restore him to the appointment of Peshkar as requested by Narasimhaiya. Mr. Ramanathan's

Flag R

Serial No

decision in this respect should be upheld. The suspension of about 3½ months adjudged as a specific penalty may stand. As regards the permanent reduction in emoluments I think it would meet the requirements of the case if he is transferred to a ministerial post on the same pay of Rs 45 where he will have no cash to handle.

2nd Secretary

26 6 27

27 JUN 192 7778

182/417

47 The investigations made by the Sub-Division Officer and the Deputy Commissioner have not established conclusively that the Peshkar acted dishonestly in ~~the~~ the cases which formed the subject of enquiry; ~~it has~~ they however, proved that he is responsible for a number of irregularities, some of which were either permitted by usage, or were allowed expressedly or impliedly by the Dharmadarsis; while others could have been checked if the Amildar had made a timely inspection of the cash and stock accounts of the institutions in the charge of the Peshkar and taken the action which the results of his inspection indicated. It is clear from the records that the Peshkar is a person who has an exaggerated idea of his own importance and accordingly, made enemies of some of the temple servants by his over-bearing behaviour towards them. His conduct, as made out from the records, also shows that he was

Note--Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

not as amenable to official discipline and control as he should have been. The allegations against them are chiefly the result of his strained relations with some of the templ servants and the Taluk Amildar and of the irregularities which he allowed and which rendered the bona fides of his actions liable to be considered as suspicious.

Peshkar Narasimiah was relieved of his duties on 25th November 1925 and he has thus been out of duty for about 18 months. Of thi period, 6 months has been regarded as combined privilege leave and furlough on full average salary, and the balance up to the date of his resumption of duty as leave without allowances. Loss of pay for about a year is a sufficient punishment to nim for the irregularities for which ne has been found responsible. It is not necessary to reduce his pay from Rs 45 to Rs 50. He cannot, however, be permitted to resume his duties as Pesnkar. He will be posted to an another appointment on his old rate of pay Rs 45 per mensem. The Muzrai Commissioner may be requested to take action accordingly.

P.J. There is one point which this memo & Settle before Order as above are issued. Is it possible to fund a post on Rs 45 for this man drawing his qualification is? What is the pay of Peshkar of Malkote? If there is post at the Muz-dept. he can be

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 192

Serial No.

The Second Member was later pleased to say that the D.P. may be left to find a suitable appt to the man on the same pay and that to minimise the hardship from want of any part of the pay whatever the Resident may be given in addition to the combined leave as much furlough on half pay as the rules permit and the balance of the absence leave as leave without allowances Mer Branch please act accordingly

Early.

MW 15/7

D.P.O. Lahore for appl

AH 11.7.1927.

MW 12/7

SECRETARIAT 30 JUL 1927 No. 305

Second Member) 87 May be sent to H Secy to See before issue

MW 14.7.

of 8 May issue if today else

15/7

MW 15/7

106 15.7.27

(4343) Muz.

Letter No.H.53/A.C. dated 8th September 1926, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore.

Narasimhaiya - Peshkar - Sri Ranganathaswami Temple - Seringapatam.

With reference to your letter No.C.383/24-25 dated the 22nd/23rd October 1924, forwarding for enquiry and report petitions received from Sthanik Rajiengar and others of Seringapatam making certain definite allegations against the Peshkar Narasimhaiya, I have the honour to forward herewith a Memo explaining the facts of the case and my findings on the several allegations against the Peshkar. I request that my action in regard to the Peshkar may kindly be approved.

" C o p y "

C.S.Balasundaram
Muzrai Commissioner.

BR.

H-53/1-C.

వేంచెసుంరు డిప్టీకమ్మీ డేవ్స్ మీరమ్మల మనరీకుంటరవర ఆర్థిసినాడ.

శ్రీరంగపట్టణాద శ్రీరంగనాథ స్వామి సన్నిధించుట దేవతార్చనదలోచ్చి
రాత్రిమద్ధ కూలు చేసి కూరు డిప్టీ కమ్మీ ఆకిసులు ఆస్థానంగే ముఖాంచు
చేసి పుచ్చుకొంటే S. నరసింహయ్యంగారిగే ఇంకొంచాలి.

నాలుగు నిమ్మ అడుగాలుగళ్ళ లుంచేసుకొంచి మీండు
ఆజ్ఞెలు ఇచ్చి ధర్మాంగవరకేసుం నిమిగే కూలు చేసుకొంటరవర్ల
ముఖచ్చి పై రూ చేలుచేసి బనకీలు బంరచా సుంచెకొంచాలు వా
డికి మేం డబ్బు పీందుంచ నమ్మిక 8-9-1926 రల్లు ఈ ఆర్థిసిసి
గుంచరాంటంసి మేంటి లుచ్చికరాంచుటికిలాంచున్న.

నిమ్మ పేరాణి పీంచుంచే బనకీలు బు రచా సుంచెకొంచాలు
చేసుకొంచాలు శ్రీ కోల్ చుంచున్నాడు.

Sd/- H. Basavaraj Urs.
for Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District

కొం॥ 24-9-26

"Copy"

C.1429 25.53

No 25.26 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, 141

Dated Bangalore, 15th September 1926.

GEN. & REV. SECRET

From

Sri

MUZRAI

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Muz 322-25-4

GEN. & REV. SECTT. PR 16. SEP. 1926 G. D. SECTION.

To

C. Ranganatha Rao Saheb, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your D.O. letter No.23/Muz.322-25 dated the 7th July 1926 requesting to be informed of the action taken in respect of the remarks made in the 1st Member's Tour notes of Inspection of March 1926 regarding the conduct of Peshkar ----- Narasimhiah of the Sri Ranganathaswami temple at Seringapatam, I have the honor to state that on receipt of the Sub Division -- Officer's detailed report in the matter, the Deputy Commissioner went to Seringapatam and verified the details by personal ------ enquiry and later on 20th July 1926 met the Dharmadarsis as well and heard them in detail besides going through their proceedings which they placed before him. The Deputy Commissioner states that considering the several circumstances both for and against Narasimhiah, he is of opinion that it is not desirable to ----- continue the official as a Peshkar or in an executive appointment, that he has taken him on duty in a ministerial appointment as Muzrai Deputy Clerk on Rs.30/- in the District Office, the -- Deputy clerk having been sent out as Peshkar of Seringapatam -- temple and that Narasimhiah who was on forced leave of 6 months (4 months privilege and 2 months full average salary) fro 25th November 1925 pending conclusion of enquiry will be treated as on suspension for the period of absence subsequent to the leave on full average salary till date of joining duty in the District -- Office, to serve as a departmental punishment for the specific -

cases of misappropriation which however are not such as can successfully be prosecuted in a ~~Civil~~ Criminal Court.

I beg to submit that I approve the action taken by the Deputy Commissioner.

I have the honor to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Assistant Commissioner
For Mukhtar Commissioner.
(Absent from the Station).

14/7/16

nbv

Registered
Chinnaiyapuram 13721

REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
12 SEP 1926
MUZRAI

N. C. REV. SECTT.
16 SEP. 1926
D. SECTION.

రుపిరత్ పిల్లుమూరు మునిస్థానద శ్రీశ్రీ శిక్కిత్తరి సాంప్రాబళవర శ్రీమంత్ మనాంబిగె -

శ్రీరంగపట్టణద శ్రీరంగనాథస్వామియవర దివ్య స్థానద పట్టాభిరామ ఒడయరవర మనవియన్ను అతి వినయదిందర్పిసి కేవాద విజ్ఞాపనేగళు - -

1 రుపిరత్ పిల్లుమూరు తిమ్మక్కనవర తీర్థప్రసాద కుమారి లక్ష్మమ్మనవర సాంప్రాబళవర 7-9 26నేయ మోర్యం ఇన్/16.27 నేసంబరు మేమే ప్రకార శ్రీవైష్ణవరిగె మాత్రవల్లదే ఇతర ధర్మద అనేకరిగె శ్రీవైష్ణవరు కొంబిద్దారెందు తిళిదు, ఈ కారణదింద శ్రీవైష్ణవన్న రుపిరత్ తీర్థప్రసాద కుమారి లక్ష్మమ్మనవర తవర ఆస్థానిగన్ను నుంగిక్కె తీర్థప్రసాద మండ్గి యాగి 30 రూపాయి కొబ్బరియన్ను కొట్టరం మాడిరువదాగియూ 25-9-1926రల్లాగిరువ పట్టాభిషేక దినదందు సాశేరి మేలే పూజారాగువ కాలవన్న సన్మానిసువుదిల్లవెందు తిళిసి అర్జీ మూలధారి వ్యవహారంశ్రీదన్ను సనదిమాడిసి 24-11-1925నే వేంకట్యం లచ/2324 నేసంబరు దస్కత్తుగళన్ను మాడిసి అజ్ఞేయ ఆగ్రహక్కె ఉపపాత్రరాగి దూరవిరువంతే మాడుతొళగిరువుదాగి రుపిరత్ తీర్థప్రసాద కుమారి లక్ష్మమ్మనవర చరిత్ర దస్కత్తు ఈగిసిదే

2 నాను శ్రీరంగపట్టణద శ్రీరంగనాథస్వామియ దివ్య స్థానద పెరుమాళ్ళ సేవార్థవాగి 7 ఎకరె నీరావరి జమీన్ను కాలదల్లి భక్తాదిగళన్ను పోషిసుత్తా బందిరువుదు నిమగే గొత్తాగిరబహుదు 8-10 సాలిన రూపాయిగళన్ను కొడువుదాగి 2 సాలిన రూపాయిగళన్ను సమసంద్యగళన్ను, పూజారిగళిగె దక్షిణె, పల్లకియ ప్రదక్షిణెగళన్ను, 4-5 కావడి చరుపాయి ప్రసాదగళన్ను ప్రతివర్షవూ కొడువుదాగి నిమ్మ పూర్వజరు మత్తు నానూ ఇల్లియవరెగూ నడెసికొండు బరుత్తిద్దేవె ఆదరె సుమారు ఇంగ్లీషావిర రూపాయిగళు ఖర్చాగుత్తిరువుదరింద నమ్మ ప్రభుగళు

కొంచెదారి లిఖ్యణాదింద కేలవమంది కొంతు బంది
ద్దేవే. శ్రీరంగనాథస్వామియవర జీవనశ్చానబల్లి నిష్ఠుశ్రీ
పూతవాగి మొతకదింద కేలవమాత్రంతిద్దే నన్నమేలే నన్న
కొంచిదార్కుగళు కేలవరిగే అభిమంధాన లూంటొదిక్కె
నన్న కొంజిదార్కుగళ బ్లిగి కేలవరు ఖదాంధ్రగళన్నూ, నగ
నాణ్యగళన్నూ, కిద్దు బిరిగిద్దుత్తిర్ప ఇద్దుదన్ను నాను కరెదు
ఉతిదు నానం అప్పుగళన్ను గంటించిట్టిసి మీరుర్మాతిసి
లిఖ్యోట్టేద్ధరిత. దొడ్డిన్నాకిగే కళుదిసిద్దల్లదే ఇన్నూ
బ్బిబ్బి నాకరు చీఫనిద్రానక్కిసంబంధపట్టి సగసాజ్ఞెగళ
న్ను సరిశ్శరదల్లిట్టుకొండే బతాసట్ బళిసికొండ్ తద్దద్దన్ను నాన
కరతలాతిదు ఆంతకు కూడతిగళిగే బేంజారుంతక దొడ్డిన్
దుల్ మాడిసి లిఖ్యోట్టే మాడిదను కృతిత్తంగాగి కిళ్ళద
వరత్రంపట్టేదగళాదుల్లు చిల్లరే నాకరుగళ ఆక్రమగళన్ను
సరిపడిసువదక్కాగి చీఫనిద్రాసగళ గౌరవవన్ను బళసదక్కి
సగుర్బ్ నానుమాడిద లిఖ్యోట్టేంద్రస్వామిగళు కేలుతీపరివి
గూ శ్రీవిదిలాగిదే బాకీయల్లా సందుకొరువదు మత్తి
నాకరుగళ ఆర్థిక్యనవన్ను ముక్తిగొస్తి బాస్తి మాడి ఇమ్మ
బ్లిగి కేలవరు చాలభాంతరగళింద ప్రేంక్షేపంకు ప్రేమ నన్న
మేలే ఆంకెగళబల్లి కాచ్చకాగళన్ను ప్రాచంన్నమాడి
క్షుద్ర కారక్రగళింద ఇల్లిద గలభేయన్ను లంబెమాడిరుత్తిర
ది. 1923నే ఇల్లిం దుల్లి ఇజ్జి ఆకెఆనేగళు శ్రీంగి
ఆగ్గే ఈ తీర్మానితి శిరిమాన్యసర్ బాహుబలిగాగిద్దే మీటిం
రామస్వామయ్యనవరు 9-7-1923నెరల్లి స్వళోక్కే దుంబు
మూతు ఆనేదాచార్యుగళన్నుకూగిసి కనిపేలియింద లిఖ్యోట్టే
ఆగిరుత్తే. కనిజి కాలబల్లి శ్రమపోగ్గేయుం రాజులద్దరు
మదరి లిఖ్యోట్టేద బరుమాతినిక్కుండేయు మహారాణిశీరియుంట్లు
నాకరు ఆపత్తిన స్వీకంబరాద్దు ఇల్ల మహారాయ నననే ఈ
కరుణే వరీవిగాగి, యుంబవిద్రేమ చుంబసేవంగళన్ను జు
ర్మానవగళిగే శిక్షేయంగళన్ను మాళ్పంగే మాడలాద మోసవా
రోళుదగోయంగళన్ను, యుంబ్రేమాంద ఆగిగుప్పదిల్ల

ంది నన్ను మోపిష్టు అధికారు చదువుప్రాంయుళ్ళి
శిక్షణాంగి నాను నతీదంళ్ళిం౦రు బందిరువుదు నన్న
బాబక్కె అకార్డ్ సంగత ఇరువ నానుఊరాగిరువ
బంధుల్ నల్లి నన్న బాబక్కె నవర్ తిళిసిలోయిక్కు ఇరుత్తే
బరాంబరిసిదల్లి నన్నిధానక్కె వ్యత్యాసవాగుత్తే. జీవిష్ఠానక్కె
ఉడుపంతిసిద్ద ఛద్మవారతెరద దోంక్తే మనుష్యరు పత్తిరువ
ప్రాస్తాప్రాంత చికాగోదల్లి శ్రీరంగనాథస్వామియవర జీవ
ష్ఠాపన ప్రతిష్ఠాత్సవక్కెన్న ప్రతిసి పత్రాంబరిసిదల్లి తిళిత
క్కె పూర్ణవాగుత్తే. మిక్కు నాను ఊంచరాగి తిరువ
సదాచార్యర చరణంగళు బరాంబరిసిదరే నానుమంత్రిత
వు కేలస చార్యగళ బేందనక్కు బిత్తెక్కె జీర్ణవాగుత్తేదే

1921నే ఇస్వియ మంత్రాలు నాను పద్మనాభస్వామిగళ శ్రీరంగ
ఉప్పార్ శ్రీరంగనాథస్వామియవర దానవాగినల్లి పారుత్తే
గాడ్రంగిద్దాగ, అల్లి నవర పాదపూజెయ మాడుత్తిద్ద బిళ్ళిగె
చిత్తుగళ క్రమవన్నుప్రకారంబహుదాగి ఎల్లవు మళ్ళరేంగరు సిగ్గే
దారియింద ఎరుపు బట్టెయన్ను ఇళిసి బ్రహ్మరథదల్లి నవర
ప్రతిమెయన్నిట్టు నవర పాదపూజెయ మాడుత్తిద్ద
ఎరుపు బట్టెయన్ను నవర పాదదింద తెగెదు
నన్నిధ్యవశింబుంబవదు ఇదే మనంతరద అనేక నవరత్న
గళు మోసిందల్లి అవర్ధానరంగళిగే ఖాయిలే కాణిసికొండరు
కారణాదిందలే నన్నన్ను శ్రీరంగనాథస్వామియవర జీవ
ష్ఠాపన దీక్షాకరనన్నాగి మాడికరూపాతి ఈ రుద్దేగే
ఒళ్ళదువల్లి సుమారు 9-10 మోటగే జీవసిద్ధానగళూ,
కిలవు మిస్టర్ జీవసిద్ధానగళూ లభ్యవిత్త వరెగూ నన్న
ఆత్మీయతెయ్ళి బళుదిరోల్దిద్దువల్లి

4 మోతి తారిఖే మూరిరువ ధ్వజారోహణ దినదల్లి ఈ శ్లో
వరిరువవర్ణగళ వతియింద నాను నిజవాగి భారి హిగ్గిబిట్టిరి
ప్లేలనవన బర్డ్ కొళ్ళ నతీయాకొండు తుంబిరుత్తిరువుదన్ను

కియింద రిక్వోపర్ట్ మంగిద్దాంగాద్దున్నీ. ప్రశాంద్భభవ-
రు, తీవ్రమైన ఇమియ్యప్ప నగ్ సాంబ్భిరవర్ 12-12-ఇచ్చ గాల్ల
స్టేళళ్కి దరంచమంతిని గాభీర్ధాదారకాన పై ప్ళ్ళంట్ల
క్లోల్ళ్ళగా ఉన్నగాగార్డమ్ను, చుట్టి కాపెరచ్ఛ్రగార్డమ్ను, పనిగ్ల
మాళి ప్రజెడంతుల్లారుమ్ మీరిళ్ళకొండ్రు పెలుచాంగద్ద నుంచ
బ్రింగాం కేంట్లే సాకీర్ధ చేస్తిరిదంతే తీర్మాంచారట్ల్. మీల్లిం
ఆ 8-10 లంండి సాహరరన్నాచ్చుంట్ల్ ప్రాంగాంగ్ భాగ్యస్థుంచం
మీడ్రస్థ నగిశాంచుచ్చుగార్డా, స్వీచరంగ్ర్ముంచు ప్రళ్ళ-
ప్రాంచ ఎంద్రంచ్ఛుంతే ఫ్రాంగా ప్రజెక్ట్ ఎట్టుంచ్ఛిగాన్ను ఎంద్ర్,
తీగి దంగెర్ద క్ట్ర్ను చేరుస్థ చాత్రాం ఎంద్రంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్
నచ్చేరుంచాచ్చే ఎంద్రంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ మీరుంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్
అచ్చే చ్ఛంతాంచుంచ్ఛి ఎంద్రంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్
ప్రస్తు. గుంటరచ్ఛాంగాంచు. ళ ఎంద్ర్ంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్
ప్రస్తుం.

ఎ ప్ర. దాల్లా ఱు. తీవ్రమైన ఇమియ్యప్ప నగ్ సాంబ్భిర్ర్,
చవర ఆరోపణల్లో నగ్ంగాంగారుమ దీర్ఘ్ర్ంచ్ఛు సంబ్భిర్ర్
ఆధ్వా కెర్ట్మిల్ నగ్ంగ్ర్ మీర్ఘ్ర్ంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్

(ర్) ఇచ్చేర్ధ వి॰ కారణాల్లో భూద్రిస్తుంచం ఎయాంవతే నిచ్చే
యూ నలీదిల్లో ఎయాంవకర్ధిత్వమ్ వీకర్ధిచ్చిర్ల్లో నగ్ంగ్ర్ంగ్
దీర్ఘ్వాచ్ఛాకోళ్ళర్ధ్ చుంతెరుచర తీంచరు నగ్ంగ్ర్ లిర్ధిల్లో ఆధ్వ
వచ్చ్ను సంస్థుత్తుల్లోపంరచుంచర్ధ్ ప్రచారంచిన్నవచ్చుంచి
ఆధ్వర ఎంగ్ర్ధ్ళ్ళగాంరన్ను స్వీకర్ధ్ంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్
వాంగుల్లో

(ల్) నగ్ంవి॰ కారణాల్లో ఆమోద్ధారర్ధిచరు మర్ధ్ంతుంగ్ కివిధస్థ
ఆధ్వికారచరు రిక్వోపర్ట్ మాడ్రిద్దుల్లో ఇనగ్ను నగ్ంగ్ర్ ఫ్రాంర్ధ్
ఇనాచియాంగ తీర్చుళ్ళుంకి చ్ఛోంచ్ఛుంతు నగ్ంగ్ర్ సమర్పాంయించి
చాంగర్ధ్ భోగిచ్ఛ్ర్ధ్ంచిల్లో ళ్ళ, తీవ్రమైన ఇమియ్యప్ప నగ్ సాంబ్భిర్ర్
ఐంచర రిక్వోపర్ట్ చేసేళ్ళ నగ్ంగ్ర్ నీర్ధ్ంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్

(ర్) ప్రాంచ్ఛిళ్ళకే ప్రచుర్ధ్ంచ్ఛుంతు 1921 ళ్ళ ఇచ్చే
ల చేర్ధ్ంచుళ్ళ్ ర్ధ్ంగాల్లో స్వీంచాంగార్ధ్ంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్
నగ్ 1 చ్ఛోంచ్ఛ్ర్ధ్ంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ సిద్ధుపర్ధ్ంగాంచ్ఛిర్ధ్ంగాంగ్
2 మీంచిరుగ్ సెప్టాంబ్భిర్ 4 ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్
చూ, 4 ఱు 1920, 1923 ళ్ళ స్వీర్ధ్ంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్
ఐవ్యళ్ళి కరుంకోళ్ళ్ంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్
కిర్ధ్ంచ్ఛుంతు ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్ ఎంద్ర్

గీ బందంతో తొలిసంబరమైతే. ఈర్ష్యాసహనతొలిదనంతర

ఈ రాంబాబుగాళ్ళిద్దామంత్ర నన్నెలుదాకురగ్గానే
ఉమన్న చూసి నాను 6-10-24రోజుల్లు తెల్లోల్
ఉదయంగంటసన్నాహమక్కే 6-11-24రోజుల్లు రాందిన
దానిలాతిగళ్ళ సమీక్షలో మంత్రిత్వాదులుదాకురగ్గానే
ఉమన్నలి కర్యాచరించడంక్కేనే. ఈ లుదకురగ్గాదుం
ఏంగత్త కరుణాంతరిద్దే చాన్సోళే తిరిగిస్తు పాయింట్లు
ప్రాపస్తున్నే ప్రత్యేకపుస్తగళుం తుంబిన్నే కీసిన్న ప్లేస్
మిస్టేర్ ఓనారుప్రకాష్ గోస్వామినాయిషోలో దోష
నాద్యనేకర్నే - 1922రల్లు ఏల్లాపీఠప్రస్థానసభ్యంతే
కారయూర్ధా ఉనిన్నే విదేశళ్ళి తొరిక్కిద్దున్న లైబ్రాడుపిత్తో
గాఢ పరిచయ మాగతిరుత్తాన్నే. ఈ పుస్తకపిత్తోగాఢ
నాస్తు మాత్రవల్లదే ఇదేరీతియ ప్రకాశాదంగళు జాగా
కాద్దేవన్నే 10-12-25రోజుల్లు రూబాదే లిబ్రేరియ
కుమ్మిక్షనర్ జాన్సోబాబుయవర సేంగ్రహిణియల్లి నాను
ప్రదు మేల్కాణ్ణిసిద్దవుగళు ఆదివాసి ఇతిహాసగత
పేగ్రాఫిసిదుదన్న క్కురుతిసి ప్రస్తావనేయిందదాక్కే
సంతోషవాగిదెన్నాదే. ఈ రాంబాబుగాళ్ళిగే ప్రత్యేకంతీరా
ధన్యవాదగళన్న హేళువుదక్కాగి తొళిన్నే బరేయుత్తిద్దే
ఖానాన్నిద్దారియుం హేళువుదిరుగ్గాను ఇల్లవల్లదే
ఆయుంటు తీర్మానిసిదవరు జారుపుత్తిద్దాగారణంతే
ఇద్దరు ఆయోజకరు దీర్ఘవిద్దేనళ్ళు కేలసగళల్లి
బిజియాగిద్దుదరింద ఖుద్దాగి భేటియాగలు
ఆగదిద్దవరిగాగి ఇదన్ను బరేయుత్తిద్దేనే. ఇదు
ఎరడనేయ పుస్తకవాదరూ ఇదర ప్రకాశకరు
ఖుద్దాగి భేటియాగి పుస్తకవన్ను కొడుగె మాడిదరు.
ఇదక్కాగి నానవరిగె ఋణియాగిద్దేనే. ఇదర
ముద్రణదల్లి కొంచ తప్పుగళు నుసుళిదుకొండిద్దు
ఎందు నానవరిగె తిళిసిదాగ ఆయుష్యు
ధ్యవసాయగళ్ళదారువుదక్కాగి కారణక్కే ముద్రణ విళంబవాయ్తు
ఆగిరువుదరింద ఖుద్దాగి పుస్తకవన్ను మిత్రరిగె కొడుగె
మాడలాగదిద్దరూ ఆసక్తరిగె ఇదన్ను కొడుగె మాడిదరు.
ఇదరల్లి ఇతిహాసగళు రాజకీయగళల్లి ఒందు తీరగళన్ను
ఎత్తిహిడిదిరువుదరింద ప్రస్తుతవిరువుగళల్లి ఇదన్ను కొనలు
ఎందు అనేకరు నన్నల్లి కేళిదరు. ఆదరే ఇదన్ను
ఒప్పిసువ ధైర్య మాడలిల్ల. కారణగళు ఎంతా నానుమాత్ర
అల్పస్వల్పరిగే మాత్రవల్లదే అనుభవంపూనవాగిద్ద
ఆచారుచిత్రకారరు నన్నల్లి కేళికొండ మేరెగె బలవు
తీవ్రవాగిత్తు. కారణాంతరిందా ఆచారుచిత్రకారరు
2-3 వర్షగళ అవధిగాగి మండరిసిద్దరూ ఇదన్ను
ఆచేచిసువుదాగిరలిల్ల. 1924 నే ఆగస్టో
1 నే తారీఖిగె ఒందు పత్రవు ఇద్దు ఈ విషయదల్లి
ఆసక్తరాగిద్దే నటేక ఇన్నొందు పుస్తకవన్ను కొడుగె
మాడిదరాదరూ నానే ఇదన్ను ప్రకాశిసికొళ్ళలు
నిర్ధరిసిదెనాదరూ, రికార్డుగళన్ను వ్యవస్థిత
గళూ, తిద్దిదవుగళన్ను రూపిసిదవరింద ఈర్ష్యాళి

(ఎ) ఈ కార్యక్రమ వివరాలను పత్రికా ప్రకటనల ద్వారా ప్రజలకు తెలియజేయడం జరిగింది. ఈ కార్యక్రమంలో మీ నియోజకవర్గానికి సంబంధించిన అధికారులు పాల్గొనేలా చర్యలు తీసుకోవడం జరిగింది. ఈ కార్యక్రమంలో మీ నియోజకవర్గానికి సంబంధించిన అధికారులు పాల్గొనేలా చర్యలు తీసుకోవడం జరిగింది.

(బి) 8 ఇ క్యారాగ్రాఫ్‌లో పేర్కొన్న విధంగా ఈ కార్యక్రమంలో పాల్గొనేలా చర్యలు తీసుకోవడం జరిగింది.

(సి) మీ ప్రశ్నలో ఉన్నట్లుగా ఈ కార్యక్రమంలో పాల్గొనేలా చర్యలు తీసుకోవడం జరిగింది.

[illegible]

8 [illegible]

9 [illegible]

11 ఇదంతే నిన్నే
నర్సాపూర్ పోలీస్ స్టేషన్ పరిధిలో, గుడిపాటి
లచ్చిరెడ్డి తిరుపతిరెడ్డి.

12 నన్ను అడ్రెస్.

మెయినూర్ తాలూకా రాజుపల్లి అంచె
1068 నెం. సంబర్ మనేటి సత్యనారాయణ గారి
దంగలోట్టెర 5 వరకు రెండవ ఇంటి
ముందు నేను అడ్రెస్ తెలుపు క్రైస్తవుడు.

14-9-1926

[illegible]

15059

W-133

Chauvaipalayam

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.
17 SEP 1926
MUZRAI
D. 42 f

N. & REV. SECTT.
PR
25. SEP. 1926
G.O. No.

దువరత్, మ్యూనూరుమండ్రాడ, శ్రీపేపిక్కెటెరి,

కవర, ప్రజూర్ జనాబిగె -

శ్రీరంగపట్టణాద శ్రీరంగనాథస్వామియవర దోవ

స్థానద పీఠాధిపతిగళు ఽ నరసిరుష్టాన్వయద అతివినయపూర్వక వాద

ప్రార్థనేగళు — -

1 దువరత్ మ్యూనూరుతెస్ప్రిక్ష్ తీవ్రగతి కమిషనర్

భూమ్యాచరవరు, శ్రీరంగపట్టణాద, మేఁ ధర్మదర్శిగళ వర, అ

భిప్రాయవన్నూ. స్థళీయదొడ్డమనుష్యరుగళ మత్తూ

ఆప్తన చీవస్థానగళ, నీమ్మ సేవార్థగారర, కోరికేయన్నూ.

చిక్కెక్ష్ అంగీకరిసదే. చీవస్థానద నౌకరరాగిరతక్ష్, అదర

ల్లూ, నూరుమంది ఽ నౌకరర క్ష్ గే, చీవస్థానద్ళుళువు

వగ్గే నతీసి కిక్కిరిద్దు శిక్షేగళ్గాగిరువ, 7-8 మంది నౌకరర

అన్యకవాద ఫిర్యాదుగళ్గే గమనకొట్టి, కేవల గర్భిణాద,

దొడ్డభంసొరంయూద, బతతాచీదారనాద చిద్రియన్ను, మో

హ్యాతీ నౌకరరియింద తెస్ప్రిక్ష్ మయిర్ష్ తీవ్రగతి మూర్ధ్వి

కేలసక్ష్ ఖునాంయిసి, చీవకనిగే బరుత్తలిద్ద 45 రూపా

యి తెలబినింద, 30 రూపాయిగళ్ తెలబిగె కంష్టరామంది.

ష్టూరువినొళ్ళు రుష్టిరువరొళాకొండ్ళిరుత్తేందు, అప్పణే జరు

పాలసి, శేల్ధార్ కోర్టిక్ష్ అర్జి నాగిద్దరూకూడా కేలసదమ్మనే

రావరాగువవరివిగె, సష్టేందు, 7 దినగళు కళిగమ్మనే

రుష్టం దండసొలనిద నివిన్ష్. ఫిర్యాదు ఖవర్దిసోళు, యువాగ్ష్ శిక్షేయన్ష్ అనుభవిసదవసళ్ల

నాదవయుళ్ళు మనస్సిగె శానే వ్యథనవ్ను, దొడ్డసంభారియ

జీవనజ్యోతి పంజ్వల్ కోందరికుసంభవిసి
నవ్యస్రుసిగే ప్రభాతబంద భయవవూ, వుంటాయి. ఈ
న్నెల్లూ, కెవ్రిలో వారాంగి 15-9-1926 రల్లు ఛోఁ ఎరి
మూల్య మడాళున్నిదానంగళిగే అరికే మంతిళోంతిరువదు,
మరాబ్దామింయువర, దివ్య జీవిత్వక్కే పాత్రభోఁ ఇరుత్తే. ——

2 నాను నరకురాధి, కోవలబుతవ, దొత్తనంబారి,
ఖాకాద కారణావిల్లదోలూ, నన్న తనివెంయో ఆగదోలూ, నన్ను
ఇంకెళ్ళ దిబ్బుదంతనే లాభని, ఈగ్గిళ్ళ 9 తెంగళ మేల్పట్టె కాల
దిందలూ, ప్లేళళ్ళేళ్ళోగలు, ముఖవిల్లదే, మ్రిగనంతినల్లి
వాసమం తిళ్ళోంతు, గుజరాన్ కళ్ళింయువదు, శానేదుస్థ
శవాగిదే ——

3 మేరుర్బాన్ మొవందరవరు కోవల, నణ్ణా
నాకరనమేలే, పరిపూర్ణ కృపాత్మవిట్టిన్ను, సిద్ధింయు
15-9-1926 రల్లు గుజరాయినికొంతిరువ, ప్రభిర్యయన్ను
ప్రేసవాదభిత్తిక్కొళ్ళే, సావధానవాగి ఆలోచనేసి తేగెదు
కోంతు, నన్న జీవన్మారిసాకరియన్ను, నననే అప్పణే కోరి
ది క్కొ త్రుసాకొంగరుత్తిళ్ళే. —— ——

4 నివాంయు, మరాళున్నిద్రానదల్లు కాణా
స్తిపడే ఆగువ వరిమగూ మొవందరవరు దంయమాడి,
స్వీరంగనాథస్వామింయవర జీవప్రద్దానద, జీవన్మారి సాకరి
ంతాబుద్ధ, ంయంప్రదూం దుబెదులాపనేంయూ, ఆగదంతే
ప్రార్థుం గంయుకొంతు, నిరోపాచారవన్ను, ఉద్ధారమాడి
సేకాగింయూ, భరా, ప్రతిష్ఠప్రతిష్ఠియుండు, బాంధుర్యాది
ప్రళ్ళప్రతిష్ఠే నే. మంగళవాగి —

24-9-1926

Muz 4]

SUBJECT ....

.. ..

... .

Diary No. of letter replied to 3817 / 426

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, *the* *192*

Section Muz

File No. 322 / 15-26

Serial No. 6

No. 672

Date of issue 5th October 1926

Signed by _____

To

The Muz Cmr

Sir,

Adverting to my letter no. C. 1429 dt 15 September 1926 reporting on the complaints against Peshkar Narasimhiah of Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Seringapatam I am directed to request that you will be so good as to ... over.

at a very early date.

for reference. The inclosure
by Comr's. letter refd to
in your letter under
advisement together
with the entire Vets
records bearing on the
case

(2) The records may
kindly be sent up
so as to reach this
office not later than
the 25th Oct 1926.
The 30th Sept - 1926.

I have the
honor to be
Sir
Your obdt
Servt

Secretary

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7-22

Encl 2

No. 1429 / 25-26.

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Dated Camp Mysore, 20th October 1926.

From

C.S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARY
23-OCT 1926
MUZRAI
D. 519
Mes 322 25-5

To

The Financial Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Camp Mysore.

S i r,

As desired in your letter No.672/Muz. 322-25 dated the 5th instant, I have the honour to submit herewith a copy of the Mysore District Deputy Commissioner's letter together with the records received therewith pertaining to the complaints against Peshkar Narasimhiah of Sri Ranganathaswami Temple at Seringapatam.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

C S Balasundaram Iyer

Muzrai Commissioner.

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Mem 8

File No. 322-25

Serial No 9

No. 896 Enclosures Eleven files.

To

The Dist. Collr

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

Sir,

Date of issue 16-11-26

Signed by Mr M. Venkatesa Ayangar

Adverting to your letter No. C. 1429 Dt 20-10-1926 (memo from) submitting (the ~~Inspector~~ Inspector) Dt. Collr's ~~letter~~ Report on certain allegation against Peshkar Niva... thiah of Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Sang... patam I am directed ...

List of enclosures.....

To ~~observe~~ peruse the records that the under-mentioned Register accounts (etc. are ...

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

~~for an adjudication in~~
~~the matter, and to~~ request
that you will be so good
as to obtain ~~them~~, and
send ~~them~~ up for perusal
of ~~Sir~~ ~~the~~ urgently
(i) & (ii) Ro 3 ~~(just gone Khata)~~
Khard for Oct^r., Novr and
Decr. 1920, and the Panchayat's
charge Register for
that year (1920) both
relating to Sri Gangadharaswamy
Swamy temple at S. Palaya
(i) the Original Stock register
of temple rice (showing
both receipts and issues
from Janry. 1921 to March 1925, and
(ii) the proceedings of the temple
Dharmadarsi on 20-7-1926 produced
during the D.C's inspection
of the institution
(2) the Register &c.
above may be
sent up so as to reach

G. R. S. G/33]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

This office of Calcutta
Thanks the 25th inst.
(3) The Records received
are herewith returned
(in a sealed cover)
for ref. & re-turn
I have etc.

Sd/ Illegible
13/11/26

Asst. Secretary
Sd/-
10/11/26

43431

C 383 of 1926-27.
one return of two files this year

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE

Bangalore, ...27th...January 192 7
29

FROM

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,
MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECTION
PR
29 JAN 1927
G. D. SECTION

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
29 JAN 1927
MUZRAI
19046
Judl. 322-25-

To B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

As desired in your letter No.226/322-25-9 dated the 16th November 1926, I have the honor to forward herewith the records required therein in connection with the complaint against the Peishkar Narasimhiah of Seringapatam temple with the exception of the marginally noted two - - - received with the Mysore District Deputy Commissioner's letter of the 26th instant, a copy of which is herein enclosed.

The records received with your letter under reply are also sent herewith.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C S Balasundaram Iyengar

Muzrai Commissioner.

November & December 1926.
Return to Sri Gangadhreswara
Agge register for 1926.

Letter No.H-53 A.C. dated 25/28th January 1927 from the Deputy Commissioner Mysore District to the Munsif Commissioner in Mysore.

With reference to your letter No.C.383 of 1924-25 dated 24th November 1926 calling for submission of the municipally not records in connection with the complaint against the Peshkar of the Sri Ranganathaswami temple at Seringapatam, I have the honor to state that the Amildar of Seringapatam Taluk reports that the records Sl.nos.1 and 2 are not available either in the Taluk office or in the Temple, and that it appears that C.Narasimaiya who ~~is~~ was incharge of the Sri Gangadhareswaraswamy temple in 1920 should have them etc. The statements of the Parupathegar of the Sri Gangadhareswaraswami temple stating that the records did not come to his charge and that of Narasimhiya to the effect the the records must be with the Parupathegar as he had been divest of his charge since 25-9-24, are enclosed in the file. The Kharch Patties (13 in number) for October November and December 1920 of the Sri Gangadhareswara Swami and other two temples and copy of Parupathegar's charge patti dated 15-4-1921 together with 5 books of the list of articles of jewellary (Sl.No.15 of the charge patti) received with the correspondence ending 1st. --- Seringapatam Taluk Amildar's report No.102 dated 13/15th January 1927 are sent herewith.

2. The stock register of temple rice is also enclosed. The proceedings books (3) of the Dharmadarsis havealready been submitted with this office letter No.H.33/A.C. dated 2nd December 1926."

"C o p y"

for Munsif Commissioner.

1. Kharch for October, November, and December 1920) Both relating to the Sri
2. Parupathegar's charge register for 1920.) Gangadhareswaraswamy temple.
3. The original stock register of temple rice from January 1921 to March 1925.
4. Proceedings of the Dharmadarsis of the temple.

List of enclosures to G.O.

No. 91-2/Muz. 322-25- dated the 15th July 1927.

---

1. Mysore District Deputy Commissioner's Original memorandum.

2. Ten files of vernacular records as per D.C's Office Pherist.

3. One file of vernacular records

4. Rice Stock Registers of Sri Ranganathaswamy temple (two registers)

5. Katcha Registers of Sri Gangadhareswaraswamy temple. (five registers)

6. Registers of ~~Dharmadarsis~~ Proceedings of Dharmadarsis Meeting. (Three Registers)

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

...

R e a d.-

Correspondence ending with letter No.C. 383 of 24-5 dated 29th January 1927 from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore reporting on the complaints against Peshkar Narasimhiah of Sri Ranganathaswami temple at Seringapatam.

....

Order No. 91-2/Mucr 322-25

Dated Bangalore 15th July 1927.

The allegations against Peshkar Narasimhiah in the petitions complaining against him are mainly that he re-~~appropriated money from~~ adjusted grants between sanctioned heads ~~for other purposes~~ and made purchase himself instead of through the authorised contractor, that he did so in order to have opportunities for appropriating some of the money that passed through his hands for himself, that he misappropriated certain amounts intended for the purchase of jewel to the temple and that he reduced the perquisites of temple servants and ~~also~~ treated them with harshness. Enquiries have been held by the Sub Division Officer and the Deputy Commissioner. The latter officer after a full examination of all the complaints states that the enquiry of the Sub Division Officer as tested and supplemented by his own enquiries and by a verification of original documents shows that there was misappropriation in respect of the purchase of certain cloth for Sri Gangadhareswaraswami temple and of a balance for Sri Ranganas as also some rice supplied to it

Ranganathaswami temple and that the Peshkar and some others were responsible for the loss of an appreciable quantity of rice to the temple. He is of opinion that the conduct of Peshkar Narasimhiah since his appointment as Peshkar has been unsatisfactory though he is a capable and intelligent person and can under proper control turn out very good work. Short of the irregularities referred to in the reports the institutions are stated to have been better kept and maintained during his management than previously. In view of the irregularities that came to notice during the enquiry, Narasimhiah has been on long leave since the enquiry began. The Deputy Commissioner also states that it is not desirable to continue Narasimhiah as Peshkar or in an executive appointment. He has been given privilege leave for 4 months and granted furlough on full average salary for two months thereafter and it is proposed that the rest of the period till he rejoins duty be treated as leave without allowances.

2. The Muzrai Commissioner supports the recommendation of the Deputy Commissioner.

3. On a full consideration of all the circumstances connected with this case, Government observe that the investigations made by the Sub Division Officer and the Deputy Commissioner have not established conclusively that the Peshkar acted dishonestly in any of the cases which formed the subject of enquiry. The investigations, have, however proved -

proved that he is responsible for a number of irregularities. Some of ~~which~~ these irregularities, like the cases of ~~appropriation~~ readjustment of amounts ~~sanctioned for certain expenditure~~ between different heads of expenditure for other items were either permitted by usage or were - allowed expressly or impliedly by the Dharmadarsis; while others such as the loss of rice to the temple could have been checked, if the Amildar had made a timely inspection of the cash and stock accounts of the institutions in the charge of the Peshkar and taken the action which the results of his inspection indicated. It is clear from the records that the Peshkar had an exaggerated idea of his own importance and made enemies of some of the temple servants by his overbearing behaviour towards them. His conduct, as made out from the records, also shows that he was not as amenable to official discipline and control as he should have been. The allegations against him are - chiefly the result of his strained relations with some of the temple servants and the Taluk Amildar and of the irregularities which he allowed, and which rendered the bona fides of his actions liable to be questioned.

Government therefore approve of the view of the A.M. Commr that the man should not be appointed as Peshkar of the temple at Srirangapatam, ~~or put in charge of an executive appointment~~ again but consider that it is not necessary to reduce his pay from Rs. 45 to 30. ~~The man~~ He may be posted to an ministerial - appointment on the same pay as he was drawing as Peshkar.

The Official ~~Peshkar Narasimhiah~~ was relieved of his duties on 25th November 1925, and he has thus been out of duty for about 20 months. Of this period, 6 months have been regarded as combined privilege leave and furlough on full average salary. ~~With a view to minimise hardship to the man, the Peshkar~~ He will ~~as a special case~~ be given in addition to the combined leave as much furlough on half pay as the rules permit and the rest of the absence will be treated as leave - without allowances.

until he joins ~~appointed~~ post to which he is to be appointed

12/7

Financial Secretary to Govt.

12/7

To

The Muzrai Commissioner, returning the entire records.

The Comptroller (through the Finl.Sectt)

4.7.27

Ex Hor

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

Correspondence ending with letter No. C.383 of 1924-25 dated the 29th January 1927 from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore reporting on the complaints against Peshkar Narasimhiah of Sri Ranganathaswami temple at Seringapatam.

Order No. 91-2/Muz 322-25

Dated, Bangalore, the 15th July 1927.

On a full consideration of all the circumstances connected with this case, Government observe that the investigations made by the Sub-Division Officer and the Deputy Commissioner have not established conclusively that the Peshkar acted dishonestly in any of the cases which formed the subject of enquiry. The investigations, have, however proved that he is responsible for a number of irregularities. Some of these irregularities like the cases of readjustment of amounts between different heads of expenditure were either permitted by usage or were allowed expressly or impliedly by the Dharmadarsis; while others such as the loss of rice to the temple could have been checked if the Amildar had made a timely inspection of the cash and stock accounts of the institutions in the charge of the Peshkar and taken the action which the results of his inspection indicated. It is clear from the records that the Peshkar had an exaggerated idea of his own importance and made enemies of some of the temple servants by his overbearing behaviour towards them. His conduct, as made out from the records, also shows that he was not as amenable to official discipline and control as he should have been. The allegations against him are chiefly the result of his strained relations with some of the temple servants and the Taluk Amildar and of the irregularities which he allowed, and which rendered the bona fides of his actions liable to be questioned.

Government therefore approve of the view of the Deputy Commissioner that the man should not be posted as Peshkar of the temple at Srirangapatam, but consider that it is not necessary to reduce his pay from Rs. 45 to Rs. 30. He may be posted to another appointment on the same pay as he was drawing as Peshkar.

The Official was relieved of his duties on 25th November 1925, and he has thus been out of duty for about twenty months. Of this period, six months have been regarded as combined privilege leave and furlough on full average salary. He will be given in addition to the combined leave as much furlough on half pay as the rules permit and the rest of the absence until he joins the post to which he will be appointed will be treated as leave without allowances.

M Venkatesaiya

Ag. for Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore (returning the entire records).
The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore,
(through the Financial Secretariat)

C.R.G.5.